

HOT OR NOT RESPONSES TO TITLE I QUESTIONS ABOUT ALLOCATING FUNDS TO TITLE I SCHOOLS

High School Summary:

Argument for using current calculation: Most respondents (n=8) to this question felt the current calculation reflects real numbers of students experiencing poverty at the high school level. Based on the current calculation, the schools with the highest level of poverty are receiving the most funding. If the current calculation were not used, Seeley-Swan High School would lose significant funding and this would have a big impact given the absence of other community resources (n=8). Furthermore, the current calculation is a more accurate reflection of poverty since it is based on actual enrollment, not potential enrollment (n=4). Since the MCPS high schools utilize open enrollment, the feeder pattern is not an accurate measure of poverty in the schools.

Argument for using feeder pattern calculation: Most respondents (n=9) to this question felt the feeder pattern calculation will allow Hellgate to maintain its Title I programming, thus benefiting more students. Respondents (n=6) indicated this pattern would remove the reliance on parents completing Free & Reduced Lunch applications, which they tend not to do at the high school level. The feeder pattern calculation was considered more accurate than the current F&R calculation model (n=6). The Department of Education recognizes using the current F&R calculation is inaccurate. Policy advisors (Alliance for Excellent Education) recommend using a different indicator other than F&R numbers to calculate poverty at the high school level.

Elementary School Summary:

Argument for *not including* Paxson Elementary: Several respondents (n=14) felt adding Paxson creates a yo-yo effect and reduces continuity with and sustainability of existing Title I programs. There was also a feeling that Paxson experiences a different type of poverty (situational versus generational) due to the proximity of university student housing. Additionally, respondents felt Paxson receives support from other sources, unlike other Title I schools. Finally, respondents suggested the funding amount to Paxson is not sufficient to support any programming, especially since Paxson would not need the funding to support an FRC coordinator (there is an understanding that Paxson already maintain this position without Title I funding).

Argument for *including* Paxson Elementary: Respondents (n=4) felt by including Paxson as a targeted Title I school, more students and families could be served by Title I funds. The amount of funding that could go to Paxson will not have an impact on the existing Title I schools. The funds could be used towards family involvement programming and potentially instructional coaching. By including Paxson, the district would be adhering to their Title I policy. Some respondents recognized that some university students do experience generational poverty, therefore, many eligible Paxson students are experiencing generational poverty.

HOT OR NOT
BREAKDOWN OF DATA BASED ON RESPONDENTS

1. Why we should *continue* with the Current High School Calculation (Free & Reduced Lunch Applications):

Meeting of Practitioners Responses

- a. The current calculation reflects real numbers of students in poverty (n=6).
- b. The schools with the highest poverty level receive the most funding (n=2).
- c. We should maintain a consistent calculation process.

Standing Committee Responses

- a. The current calculation reflects real numbers of students in poverty (n=2).
- b. The current calculation is based on actual enrollment.

2. Why we should *discontinue* the Current High School Calculation (Free & Reduced Lunch Applications):

Meeting of Practitioners Responses

- a. Hellgate loses money, thus an impact on students due to a loss of staffing and programming (n=5).
- a. If Hellgate is grandfathered in for one year, they may lose their program.
- b. Calculating poverty level based on filling out F&R [application] is not an accurate picture of poverty level.
- c. We were told we could NOT have a school-wide incentive program to gather free and reduced forms.
- d. Dropout and poverty rates correlate. Hellgate has the highest.

Standing Committee Responses

- a. The current calculation is not accurate measure of poverty in high schools (n=5).
- b. Relies only on F&R forms turned in (n=2).
- c. Hellgate will lose money.
- d. DOE recognized the current calculate is not accurate.
- e. Policy advisors suggest using a different indicator.

3. Why we *should use* the Feeder Pattern Calculation:

Meeting of Practitioners Responses

- a. Hellgate maintains its Title I programming (n=4).
- b. A lot of parents don't fill out the forms and may not understand the ramifications of not completing forms (n=3)
- c. The feeder pattern is a more accurate picture at the high school level.
- d. This plan will help graduation rates at Hellgate.
- e. [In] theory – sounds good.

Standing Committee Responses

- a. Hellgate maintains its Title I programming (n=2)
- b. Would not be reliant on the completion of F&R forms (n=2)
- c. Reflects poverty more accurately (n=2).
- d. Open enrollment will not impact this form as well.

- e. Focus our decision-making on what's best for our students.
4. Why we should *not use* the Feeder Pattern Calculation:
- Meeting of Practitioners**
- a. Seeley-Swan loses too much, especially given the absence of resources in Seeley Lake (n=6).
 - b. Numbers are not accurate; they are based upon open enrollment statistics (n=4).
 - c. The two Missoula schools with the highest F&R population will lose money (n=3).
 - d. Feeder formula doesn't allocate higher per child funding for schools in higher poverty bands (as required by Dept of Ed).
 - e. Observations of poverty are not a true indicator.
 - f. Only Hellgate benefits.
- Standing Committee Responses**
- a. The schools with the highest F&R numbers lose money (n=2)
 - b. Cannot use it with Seeley.
 - c. SSHS – no other resources in Seeley for F&R students.
 - d. Hard to determine actual enrollment due to open enrollment.
5. Why we should *include* Paxson Elementary
- Meeting of Practitioners Responses**
- a. More students and families will be served by Title I funds (n=3).
 - b. More continuous intervention model across district (as students move from building to building).
 - c. \$24,000 that stays with one school has a bigger impact rather than divided up amongst other schools.
 - d. Not huge deduction in funding for other schools.
 - e. Possibly go towards teacher training and family involvement.
 - f. Could use money to get more instructional coaching.
 - g. They will have an FRC regardless.
 - h. Concerned about the part of student population that comes from impoverished student housing.
- Standing Committee Responses**
- a. Serves Paxson F&R students.
 - b. Supporting generational poverty.
 - c. It's been district policy. They have demonstrated they have the percentage 2 years in a row (n=2).
 - d. Approximately \$1,000 taken away. Longevity of receiving funds/programs.
6. Why we should *not include* Paxson Elementary
- Meeting of Practitioners**
- a. Ongoing funding cuts impact program consistency at the schools with the highest needs (n=10)
 - b. Paxson experiences a different type of poverty (situational vs. generational poverty) (n=3).

- c. We need to maintain sustainability and consistency from year to year (n=2)
- d. Hard to get a program running on such a low amount of money (\$24,000 doesn't get much) (n=2).
- e. Incoming DIBELS (K) and all levels don't demonstrate need (n=2)
- f. Paxson receives support from other sources (n=2)
- g. One month of number crunching is not an accurate picture (n=2).
- h. Creates a negative dichotomy between Title students and not.
- i. Paxson is under 50% F&R Lunch.
- j. Makes it a little gray in terms of which school are included.
- k. Paxson doesn't meet or exceed the K-5 district average for F&R. It's only when you include percentages from all 3 middle schools only 1 of which is Title funded when they meet this criteria.
- l. Keeps us at 50% level – very black and white.
- m. A bit more money for other schools.

Standing Committee Responses

- a. We need to maintain consistency and sustainability from year to year (n=4)
- b. Paxson experiences a different type of poverty (situational vs. generational)
- c. There are not enough funds to hire a full time staff.
- d. Half of the Paxson student population qualifies for F&R.
- e. \$24,000 impact increase; approximately \$1,000 loss to other schools.